



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/427,639	10/27/1999	SHUNPEI YAMAZAKI	0756-2053	3558

22204 7590 11/19/2003

NIXON PEABODY, LLP
401 9TH STREET, NW
SUITE 900
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128

EXAMINER

NELSON, ALECIA DIANE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

21

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/427,639

Applicant(s)

YAMAZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Alecia D. Nelson

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. **Claims 1-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admittance of prior art in view of Ernstoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,090,219) and Ohwada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,750,813).

With reference to **claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 9** the Applicant discusses the conventional art of a field sequential driving method in which one image frame is divided into three subframes and each one of the red, green and blue backlights are turned on

for one-third frame duration to display an image corresponding to that color for one-third frame duration. The Applicant also discusses that the video signal supplied to the liquid crystal panel is obtained by compressing an original red, green, and blue video signal entered from outside to one-third the time axis direction, which relates to the functionality of the claimed n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit, and that the red, green and blue LEDs are turned on successively during their corresponding LED turn-on periods (T_r , T_g , T_b), which relates to the functionality of the claimed backlight (see page 2, line 11-page 3, line 21).

The admitted prior art fails to discuss displaying each of the red, green, and blue images in each of the subframes. Even though it is taught that the display device of the conventional art is an AM-LCD there is no discussion of the specific components of the LCD panel as claimed.

Ernstoff et al. teaches a liquid crystal field sequential color display in which one image frame comprises 2 fields, each of which comprises a red image, a green image, and a blue image (see column 7, line 68-column 8, line 34). With reference to **claims 2, 4, and 7** Ernstoff et al. teaches that the frame comprises 2 fields, however it would be possible to have 3 fields in each frame by shortening the duration of each field thereby further reducing the amount of flicker seen by the observer. With further reference to **claims 3 and 6**, Ernstoff et al. teaches that three light sources (204, 206, 208) representing each of the primary colors are operated one at a time, in a repetitive sequence by switch (216), at a rate such that the complete 3-color sequence is completed more rapidly than the flicker fusion frequency. A synchronizing means (222)

Art Unit: 2675

controls switching means (216) supplying power to the light sources in the manner indicated in Fig. 10 (see column 7, lines 40-58).

Ohwada et al. teaches an AM-LCD wherein the display comprises a glass substrate, which is known in the art to have an insulating surface, wherein the active matrix circuit (1), the driver circuits (4, 5), and a voltage-timing transforming circuit (7) and all or a part of a timing generating circuit (8) are formed in the form of thin film transistors on a glass substrate (see column 3, lines 15-20).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow displaying RGB images in each subframe as taught by Ernstoff et al. along with the drive method of the admitted prior art on an AM-LCD to be constructed similar to that which is taught by Ohwada et al. thereby allowing all or a majority of the circuitry to be composed as an integrated circuit which requires less space in order to provide the user with a liquid crystal field sequential display that has improved display quality with a reduced amount of flicker observed by the user.

4. **Claims 10-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admittance of prior art in view of Ernstoff et al. and Ohwada et al. as applied to **claims 3 and 9** above, and further in view of McDowall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,262).

With reference to the claims neither the admittance of prior art, Ernstoff et al., nor Ohwada et al. teach the particular type of device that contain the liquid crystal device.

McDowall et al. teaches, with specific reference to **claims 10 and 21**, that construction of a color display with particular advantages for head mounted and head coupled displays (see abstract. However, with reference to **claims 11-20 and 22-31**, McDowall et al. further states field sequential displays are of great interest in situations that require small color displays (see column 2, lines 33-44).

Therefore it would have been obvious to allow for the liquid crystal display device with a reduction in noticeable flickering to be constructed in a plurality of different devices to thereby increase the marketability of the product.

5. **Claims 32-34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admittance of prior art in view of Ernstoff et al., Ohwada et al, and Konno et al (U.S. patent No. (5,327,229).

With reference to **claims 32-34** the Applicant discusses the conventional art of a field sequential driving method in which one image frame is divided into three subframes and each one of the red, green and blue backlights are turned on for one-third frame duration to display an image corresponding to that color for one-third frame duration. The Applicant also discusses that the video signal supplied to the liquid crystal panel is obtained by compressing an original red, green, and blue video signal entered from outside to one-third the time axis direction, which relates to the functionality of the claimed n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit, and that the red, green and blue LEDs are turned on successively during their

corresponding LED turn-on periods (T_r , T_g , T_b), which relates to the functionality of the claimed backlight (see page 2, line 11-page 3, line 21).

The admitted prior art fails to discuss displaying each of the red, green, and blue images in each of the subframes. Even though it is taught that the display device of the conventional art is an AM-LCD there is no discussion of the specific components of the LCD panel as claimed.

Ernstoff et al. teaches a liquid crystal field sequential color display in which one image frame comprises 2 fields, each of which comprises a red image, a green image, and a blue image (see column 7, line 68-column 8, line 34). Ernstoff et al. teaches that the frame comprises 2 fields, however it would be possible to have 3 fields in each frame by shortening the duration of each field thereby further reducing the amount of flicker seen by the observer. Ernstoff et al. also teaches that three light sources (204, 206, 208) representing each of the primary colors are operated one at a time, in a repetitive sequence by switch (216), at a rate such that the complete 3-color sequence is completed more rapidly than the flicker fusion frequency. A synchronizing means (222) controls switching means (216) supplying power to the light sources in the manner indicated in Fig. 10 (see column 7, lines 40-58).

Ohwada et al. teaches an AM-LCD wherein the display comprises a glass substrate, which is known in the art to have an insulating surface, wherein the active matrix circuit (1), the driver circuits (4, 5), and a voltage-timing transforming circuit (7) and all or a part of a timing generating circuit (8) are formed in the form of thin film transistors on a glass substrate (see column 3, lines 15-20).

Konno et al. teaches the usage of a photo-conductive layer (23) in which the impedance thereof is fairly constant by controlling the light absorbance characteristics of the dielectric mirror (24) as such that a leakage of light is reduced and thereby providing a uniform amount of light received by the display.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to, combine that which is taught by Konno et al. as explained to the liquid crystal display as taught by Kubota et al., the drive method as taught by Ernstoff et al. and that which is admitted by the applicant with reference to conventional art, to thereby provide a liquid crystal field sequential display that has improved display quality and reduced amount of flicker observed by the user.

6. **Claims 35-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admittance of prior art in view of Ernstoff et al. and Ohwada et al. and Konno et al. as applied to **claims 32-34** above, and further in view of McDowall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,262).

With reference to the claims neither the admittance of prior art, Ernstoff et al., nor Ohwada et al. teach the particular type of device that contain the liquid crystal device.

McDowall et al. teaches, with specific reference to **claim 35**, that construction of a color display with particular advantages for head mounted and head coupled displays (see abstract. However, with reference to **claims 36-45**, McDowall et al. further states field sequential displays are of great interest in situations that require small color displays (see column 2, lines 33-44).

Therefore it would have been obvious to allow for the liquid crystal display device with a reduction in noticeable flickering to be constructed in a plurality of different devices to thereby increase the marketability of the product.

Response to Arguments


7. Applicant's arguments with respect to ***claims 1-45*** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alecia D. Nelson whose telephone number is (703) 305-0143. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras can be reached on (703) 305-9720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-2600.



STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

adn/AND
November 16, 2003